DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 452 736 FL 026 709

AUTHOR Fukuya, Yoshinori; Reeve, Melissa; Gisi, Jeniffer; Christianson, Mary

TITLE Does Focus on Form Work for Teaching Sociopragmatics?
PUB DATE 1998-00-00
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning (12th, Urbana, IL, Spring 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Discourse Analysis; *English (Second Language); *Grammar; Higher Education; Language Patterns; *Pragmatics; *Pretests Posttests; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Sociolinguistics; Speech Acts; Statistical Analysis; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This exploratory study examines the efficacy of Focus on Form (i.e., brief instruction on linguistic forms while learners engage in meaning) at the pragmatic level. Specifically, comparing Focus on FormS (interactions followed by explicit debriefing on pragmatic forms) and Focus on Form (interactions followed by debriefing on meaning), the researchers investigated to what extent these two paradigms of language instruction affected learners' ability to request. Three groups (Focus on FormS {FonFS}, Focus on Form {FonF}; Control) of university level English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) students took DCTs for pre- and post-tests. Two groups (FonFS and FonF) received an "interaction enhancement" treatment, which consisted of rehearsal, performance, and debriefing stages. While no significant differences were found among the three treatment groups, these inconclusive findings should not be seen as evidence of the failure of FonF in the realm of second language pragmatics instruction. The brevity of the treatment, combined with the implicit nature of the treatment made statistically significant results unlikely. The study found a trend in "degree of directness" among the three groups and suggests that the treatment was just beginning to "catch." This presents suggestions for future research. (Contains 29 references.) (KFT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 452 736

Does Focus on Form Work for Teaching Sociopragmatics?

Yoshinori Fukuya, Melissa Reeve,
Jeniffer Gisi & Mary Christianson

University of Hawai'i at Manoa

Paper presented at the 12th International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (1998).

This exploratory study examined the efficacy of Focus on Form (i.e., brief instruction on linguistic forms while learners engage in meaning) at the pragmatic level. Specifically, comparing Focus on FormS (interactions followed by explicit debriefing on pragmatic forms) and Focus on Form (interactions followed by debriefing on meaning), the researchers investigated to what extent these two paradigms of language instruction affected learners' ability to request. Three groups (FonFS; FonF; Control) of university-level ESL students took DCTs for pre- and posttests. Two groups (FonFS and FonF) received an "interaction enhancement" treatment, which consisted of rehearsal, performance and debriefing stages. The study found a trend in "Degree of Directness" among the three groups and presents suggestions for future research.

THREE PARADIGMS IN SECOND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

The pendulum of second language instruction has swung between forms and meaning. As Long and Robinson (1998) explained, Focus on FormS is the "synthetic" approach (Wilkins, 1976) in which teachers present linguistic items in a linear and additive fashion and learners' task is to synthesize them (See Table 1). Focus on FormS encompasses synthetic syllabuses (e.g., structural, situational, notional-functional), synthetic methods (e.g., Total Physical Response, Silent Way) and classroom activities, such as display questions and transformation

Yoshinori Fukuya

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

exercises. On the other hand, the advocates of Focus on meaning claim that learners learn languages best when they experience them as a means of communication and that incidental (i.e., without intention, while doing something else) and implicit (i.e., without awareness) learning is sufficient for adults' successful second language acquisition. Focus on meaning includes immersion programs, Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) and Prahbu's (1987) procedural syllabus.

Table 1
Options in Language Teaching

Focus on FormS	Focus on Form	Focus on meaning
Language learning as the accumulation of language elements	Brief instruction on linguistic forms while learners engage in meaning	Language as a medium of communication
Structural and notional-functional syllabuses	Task-based language teaching	Immersion programs

Long & Robinson (1998)

While these two paradigms have enjoyed their theoretical and pedagogical popularity, Focus on Form (Long 1991) has slowly but steadily gained researchers' and teachers' attention. "Focus on form involves ... an occasional shift in attention to linguistic code features – by the teacher and /or one or more students – triggered by perceived problems with comprehension or production" (Long & Robinson, 1998, p. 23). In other words, it is characterized as learners' engagement in meaning with brief interventions and brief explicit instruction of linguistic codes (Doughty & Williams, 1998). Focus on Form is motivated by the Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1981, 1983) and "Noticing" hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990, 1993). Teachers and researchers in this framework concern themselves with both negotiation of meanings and the allocation of

learners' focal attention. Empirically, the bulk of research has begun to demonstrate the efficacy of Focus on Form in addressing persistent learning problems such as questions (Spada & Lightbown, 1993), relative clauses (Doughty, 1991) and participial adjectives (Williams & Evans, 1998).

Although studies on Focus on Form have revolved around the morpho-syntactical domain, some researchers (Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1997; Doughty & Williams, 1998) suggested that the principles and efficacy of Focus on Form might be applied to the discourse and pragmatic levels. The present, exploratory study is the first attempt to examine the efficacy of Focus on Form at the pragmatic level.

THE OPERATIONALIZATION OF FOCUS ON FORM AT THE PRAGMATIC LEVEL

Based on the above-mentioned definitions of FonF provided by Doughty and Williams (1998) and Long and Robinson (1998), the following five operational definitions are provided for the present study.

(1) Learners must be engaged in meaning.
(2) Intervention must be brief.
(3) Context must be maintained throughout the FonF application.
(4) Students must notice what their sociopragmatic failures are by having their attention drawn to the problematic area.
(5) Positive feedback must be provided when sociopragmatic failures occur.

THE EFFICACY OF TWO TEACHING PARADIGMS (FOCUS ON FORMS AND FOCUS ON FORM) AT THE PRAGMATIC LEVEL

One of the purposes of this study is to compare the efficacy of two teaching paradigms. In the area of Focus on FormS at the pragmatic level, some empirical studies have indicated the teachability of pragmatic knowledge (See Kasper, 1997 for review), such as the Japanese pragmatic routine formula, *sumimasen* (Tateyama, Kasper, Mui, Tay & Thananart, 1997), apologies (Olshtain

& Cohen, 1990), compliments (Billmyer, 1990) and conversational implicature (Kubota, 1995).

Among these studies, only Tateyama, et al. (1997) has empirically demonstrated the effectiveness of an explicit approach over an implicit one with adult learners. The Japanese pragmatic routine formula, *sumimasen*, functions differently, depending on contexts, as an attention-getter, an apology and an expression of gratitude. In Tatayama's study, two groups of university students watched some video clips. An explicit group learned the various discourse functions, illocutionary forces and politeness values of the expression *sumimasen* through a discussion and explanations for one 50-minute class session, whereas an implicit group did not do such activities. The study showed that the explicitly instructed group scored higher than the implicit group in three of four role-play situations which required various uses of *sumimasen*.

However, it is too early to conclude the effectiveness of explicit instruction over implicit instruction to adult language learners. House (1996) investigated how two approaches develop pragmatic fluency (gambits, discourse strategies and speech acts) of advanced German university students of English and the study found no significant differences between the two approaches. Both explicit and implicit groups took a 14-week communication course, in which they learned and practiced routines. The different treatments given to them were: (1) the explicit group received explicit metapragmatic information on the use and function of routines, while implicit group did not receive it; (2) auto-feedback was elicited from the explicit group, linking their observed performance to metapragmatic awareness after they listened to tapes of their own language behavior, whereas the implicit group did not have metapragmatic explanations .

after they listened to tapes of their own language behavior. Both groups improved during the 14-week course, although the explicit group had a more active repertoire of gambits and discourse strategies.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In contrast to above studies in the area of Focus on FormS, no research studies have ventured into the pragmatic realm in the area of Focus on Form. This fact prompted the researchers to pose the following three questions. The answers to these questions are needed for pedagogical considerations for teaching pragmatics in the classroom.

(1) To what extent does Focus on Form (interactions followed by debriefing on meaning) affect students' ability to make sociopragmatically appropriate requests, with regards to:
   (a) speech act, (b) formulaic expressions, (c) amount of information, (d) degree of formality, (e) directness, and (f) politeness

(2) To what extent does Focus on FormS (interactions followed by explicit debriefing on pragmatic forms) affect students' ability to make sociopragmatically appropriate requests (i.e., with respect to the six criteria a-f, outlined above)?

(3) Which is more effective for teaching students to make sociopragmatically appropriate requests, Focus on Form or Focus on FormS?

METHODOLOGY

Participants and Research Design

The participants consisted of two classes (16 undergraduate and 16 graduate students) in the English Language Institute at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Their TOEFL scores ranged from 500 to 599. As Table 2 shows, the students in each of these two classes were randomly divided into three groups: the experimental group 1 (Focus on FormS) consisted of 10 (5 undergraduate and 5 graduate) students; the experimental group 2 (Focus on Form) consisted of 13 (6 undergraduate and 7 graduate) students; the control group consisted of 9 (5 undergraduate and 4 graduate) students. However, the data for 27 students (8 students in EX1, 11 students in EX2 and 8 students in Control Group) were analyzed because 5 among these 32 students did not consent to the use of their data in the research. These 27 students were composed of 12 Japanese, 8 Chinese, 4 Koreans, 2 Taiwanese and a Russian.

Table 2
A Summary of Grouping Students

Class	N of S	Status	N of S	Group
X	16	Undergraduate	5 6 5	Experimental G 1 (FonFormS) Experimental G 2 (FonForm) Control
Y	16	Graduate	5 7 4	Experimental G 1 (FonFormS) Experimental G 2 (FonForm) Control

Note: N of S = The number of students

These three groups were instructed by Caucasian American females in their mid-20s. The regular instructor of class X instructed Experimental Group 1 (Focus on FormS), while the regular instructor of class Y instructed Experimental Group 2 (Focus on Form). A third regular instructor instructed the Control Group.

The research was conducted over a period of 4 weeks. The first DCT was administered as a pre-test 10 days prior to the beginning of the treatment. Two days prior to the first day of treatment, one 50-minute session was spent on the explanation of the research, participants' filling out the consent form, the instruction on role-plays and researchers' demonstration of role-plays. The treatment itself was given in four 50-minute sessions over a period of 8 days. The post-test followed the final day of treatment after 10 days.

Pre- and Post- test (Discourse Completion Test)

Written DCTs, which were questionnaires in which respondents wrote how they would realize speech acts in given contexts. were administered. DCTs were employed because they allowed the researchers to collect a large amount of data quickly (Beebe & Cummings, 1985). The total data pool for this study included 28 students X 48 items (24 items each in both pre- and post-test) X 6 rating criteria X 2 raters. More importantly, DCTs were used because three variables had to be controlled. These variables are possible causes of sociopragmatic failure: (a) social power distance, (b) degree of imposition, and (c) relative rights and obligations (Leech, 1983; Thomas, 1983). Items on the DCTs in this study focused on students' management of social power distance, while degree of imposition and relative rights and obligations were held constant. Specifically, the 24 items on the DCT consisted of three examples from each of four possible combinations of social distance (i.e., the familiarity of the interlocutors) and power (i.e., interlocutors' relative status), as shown in Table 3.

Table 3
A Framework for Power and Distance Relationships

	+ POWER	- POWER
+ DISTANCE	apartment manager customs officer manager customer customer	renter traveler job applicant salesperson restaurant staff
- DISTANCE	supervisor lease-holder club president teacher	worker house-mate club member student

Hudson, Detmer & Brown (1995)

DCT Form A (24 items) and B (24 items) were prepared, with the items in Form A being directly taken from Hudson, Detmer and Brown (1995) and the 24 items in Form B being modified versions of the Form A items. The posttest used the same DCT forms that were used in the pretest. Sixteen (8 undergraduate and 8 graduate) students took Form A as the pretest and Form B as the posttest; the remaining 16 (8 undergraduate and 8 graduate) students took Form B as the pretest and Form A as the posttest.

Treatment (Interaction Enhancement)

Based on DiPietro's (1987) strategic interaction approach, Muranoi (1996) developed interaction enhancement, that is, a problem-solving task by use of scenarios, for teaching the English article system. The present study employed a modified version of the interaction enhancement approach for teaching sociopragmatics.

Four scenarios were created and presented to the students. These scenarios used for interactions were (1) Renter – Landlord, (2) Professor – Graduate Assistant, (3) Professor – Student, and (4) Boss – Employee. Each scenario required the students to make a high-imposition request to a person of

higher status, though the exact degree of the status differential varied by scenarios. The social distance between interlocutors also varied between role-play scenarios. The order of these scenarios was organized in such a way that participants would presumably find the first scenario (i.e., Renter – Landlord) easiest to perform and the last one (i.e., Boss – Employee) most difficult to do because of the degree of face-threatening entailed in making each request. Each of these four scenarios was employed in one of four 50-minute sessions.

The interaction enhancement treatment (See Appendix A) consisted of three stages: rehearsal, performance, and debriefing. In the rehearsal phase, students were given a sociopragmatic scenario that involved two roles with conflicting goals. In each scenario, Role A was always played by the student, and Role B by the instructor. The students practiced these scenarios in pairs. Success in each interaction required the students' acknowledgment of and adherence to norms of social power, social distance, and degree of imposition.

During the performance stage, three different students performed each scenario for the rest of the class, with one student acting one role and the instructor in the other role each time. As the instructor and the student participated in the role-play, the rest of the class observed the interaction and the students in the experimental groups completed Role-Play Feedback Form based on what transpired in the interaction. The instructors in the experimental groups provided brief, explicit focus on form when the performing student said something inappropriate regarding the social distance, social power, or degree of imposition inherent in the scenario. This brief, explicit focus on form was operationalized by the instructor raising a sign depicting a sad face when a student made an inappropriate utterance. This raised sign was accompanied by

the instructor's repetition of the student's inappropriate utterance with a rising intonation. This procedure was designed to focus the students' attention on the pragmatic failure without completely interrupting the interaction.

The following example models the type of pragmatic failure observed in the treatment and the resulting focus on form, both in italics:

A Scenario:

Student

You are writing a term paper for one of your classes. Your professor is a leading expert on the subject you have chosen for your paper, and you would like to interview him to get more information about your topic. At the end of this week, your professor is leaving town to attend an academic conference. Your paper is when he returns after two weeks, so you must schedule the interview for before he leaves town. You estimate that the interview will last for one hour.

Professor

You are very busy preparing for an academic conference you will attend next week. You are one of the main presenters at this conference, which is the largest international conference held in your specialty field each year. You sill haven't finished writing your speech for the conference, and you have many slides to prepare for your presentation as well. You have told your students that office hours are canceled for the week, because you need as much time as you can to prepare for the conference.

Instructor: Do you think you can e-mail me your most important questions?

Student: Oh yeah, I can e-mail you, and *you can just write me an answer.*

Instructor: ☹ *I can just write you an answer?*

In the above example, consider the social power distance between a student and the professor, and the high imposition of a student requesting that her busy professor make time for an e-mail interview. The instructor playing the "professor" role in the above scenario deemed the student's choice to phrase her request as a permission grant (i.e. *you can*) as pragmatically inappropriate.

Following the three student-instructor performances, each instructor led her group in one of three types of debriefing: forms-focused (EG1), meaning-

focused (EG2), or content-of-interaction-focused (Control). In the forms-focused debriefing (EX1), the instructor drew the students' attention to the actual utterances used in the performances, specifically commenting on pragmatically inappropriate utterances based on the social power and status difference of the participants. This debriefing also explicitly addressed pragmatic strategies, providing the students with appropriate utterances for each scenario. In the meaning-focused debriefing (EX2), the instructor led the class in a discussion of the communicative goals of the participants and the social status differences between the interlocutors. This debriefing also addressed cultural issues involved in the scenario. In the content-of-interaction-focused debriefing (Control), the instructor led the class in a discussion of the content of the scenario, including questions about the students' opinion and personal experience with these type of situations.

As shown in Appendix A, the type of treatment in the rehearsal and performance phases was held constant for both experimental groups. The control group participated in the same rehearsal stage as the experimental groups did, but the control group did not receive the sad face sign or repetition with rising intonation for any pragmatic failures during the performance phase.

ASSESSMENT OF DCT DATA AND INTERRATER RELIABILITY

Three native English-speakers assessed the DCT data with 5-point scaling according to 6 criteria (See Table 4), which were adapted from Hudson, Detmer & Brown (1995). After all the tests had been scored by at least two raters, pairs of ratings which differed by more than two points were settled by a third rater.

Table 4
Six Criteria for Rating

Criteria	Explanations
Ability to use the correct speech act	How appropriate is this speech act appropriate for this situation?
Formulaic expressions	How appropriate are the expressions? Ungrammaticality is not an issue.
Amount of speech used and information given	How appropriate are the amount of speech used and information given?
Degree of formality	Word choice, phrasing, use of titles and choice of verb forms can express formality.
Degree of directness	Verb form or strategy choice can indicate directness.
Degree of politeness	An example is the use of politeness markers.

Hudson, Detmer & Brown (1995)

Interrater reliability was calculated using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Table 5 shows the correlations among the three raters. The overall reliability of the ratings was estimated using the Spearman-Brown Prophecy formula, as described in Brown (1996). This adjustment takes into consideration how consistent the test is when the ratings are taken together rather than considering the correlations separately.

Table 5
Interrater Correlations

	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3
Rater 1	1.00		
Rater 2	0.76*	1.00	
Rater 3	0.78*	0.75*	1.00
Adjusted with Spearman-Brown Prophecy formula			0.86

* significant at .01

Another way of looking at the reliability of the ratings involved calculating the percentage of ratings matched. It was found that 76.14% of the paired ratings exactly matched and 89.87% were within one point of each other. This approach was initially considered because of the difficulty in achieving satisfactory interrater correlations. The researchers felt that without a concrete understanding of what a "3" in "formality" meant as opposed to a "2" or a "4" in that category, assigning ratings for each category was extremely subjective and sometimes arbitrary. Therefore, the looser interpretation of "agreement" was operationalized to include ratings that fell within one point of each other. Yamashita (1996) reported similar reliability estimates for her Japanese version of the Hudson, Detmer and Brown's (1995) DCT.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Because this study was exploratory, the following discussion is meant to be guidance for further investigation into FonF at the pragmatic realm.

A Trend in Degree of Directness

The alpha level was set at .05. ANOVA was conducted 12 times in the data analysis of this study. Following the idea of Bonferroni, only when the researchers obtain less than 0.004 P-value can we claim it to be statistically significant in this case. Bonferroni's theory postulates that the more researchers conduct ANOVA on the same population, the more they come up with statistically significant results *by chance*. To reduce this chance, researchers must divide the alpha level (.05 in this case) by the frequency of ANOVA.

As Table 6 shows, one-way analysis of variance indicated that there were no statistically significant differences among the three groups (EX1, EX2 and

Control Group) in the results on six assessment criteria based on the 24 items of the Discourse Completion Tests (i.e., both pretest and posttest).

Table 6
The Summary of Statistical Results according to Six Assessment Criteria

Assessment Criteria	Statistical Results
Speech Act	$F(2, 24) = .356$, $p = .7044$
Formulaic Expression	$F(2, 24) = .188$, $p = .8298$
Amount of Information	$F(2, 24) = .512$, $p = .6060$
Degree of Formality	$F(2, 24) = .531$, $p = .5948$
Degree of Directness	$F(2, 24) = 2.421$, $p = .1103$
Degree of Politeness	$F(2, 24) = .896$, $p = .4214$

After completing the above analyses, the researchers suspected that although there were no statistically significant differences among the three groups' overall performances on the DCTs, the treatment may have had an effect on students' performances on a subset of six particular DCT items. Three of these six items had + distance and the other three had - distance, while all of these six items had - power and + imposition. All four scenarios in the interaction enhancement had the same combinations of three variables as these six items had. By employing these scenarios, the instructors in the two experimental groups (i.e., FonFS and FonF) explicitly and implicitly taught students how to behave in situations with those combinations of the variables. The four scenarios used in the interaction enhancement had not directly addressed the other combinations of distance/power/imposition variables that appeared in the remaining 18 DCT items. Hence, the six DCT items which most closely resembled the interaction enhancement scenarios were analyzed separately.

As a result of ANOVA based on only six items, a trend was found in only one criterion, that is, "Degree of Directness" ($F(2, 24) = 3.962$, $p = .0326$) among the three groups (EX1, EX2 and Control Group), as shown in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7
Means Table of Three Groups Focused on Six Items in Degree of Directness

	Subject	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error
FonFS, Pre	8	2.834	.455	.161
FonF, Pre	11	2.941	.531	.160
Control, Pre	8	3.260	.949	.335
FonFS, Post	8	3.719	.641	.227
FonF, Post	11	3.765	.832	.251
Control, Post	8	3.148	.416	.147

Table 8
ANOVA Table in Degree of Directness Focused on Six Items

Source	Degree of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Value	P-Value
Test X Group	2	2.616	1.308	3.962	.0326

These findings may suggest that no sociopragmatic generalization occurred. The participants were taught through four scenarios that had either + distance or - distance, with - power and + imposition. The researchers initially suspected that the participants might generalize appropriate ways of behaving to other scenes that had different combinations of the three sociopragmatic variables (i.e., power, distance and imposition). Yet the findings did not meet the researchers' expectation. It should be noted, however, that exposure to a total of four role-play scenarios may have been insufficient input to achieve generalization of sociopragmatic competence to the wide range of scenarios represented on the DCTs.

While the findings are inconclusive regarding the efficacy of Focus on Form in the instruction of pragmatics using interaction enhancement, one cannot completely dismiss the future possibility of further Focus on Form studies yielding significant results. A trend in Degree of Directness shows some promise for the efficacy of the interaction enhancement treatment, considering the brief

duration of the treatment in this study. A longer application of the interaction enhancement treatment may lead to more significant development of students' sociopragmatic abilities, particularly in Degree of Directness.

The Use of Interaction Enhancement

The use of Muranoi's (1996) interaction enhancement for this study proved challenging. Throughout the treatment, the FonFS and FonF instructors found that the treatment was very difficult to operationalize in an effective way while preserving the continuity and naturalness of the role- play. The researchers also found it quite challenging to provide on-line feedback to students' performance. The demands placed on the instructors in this treatment technique included simultaneously looking for the pragmatic breakdown, focusing the student on the error, providing the repetition in a natural way and then resuming the role play. An added demand on the instructors' cognitive load was the requirement that they remember the pragmatic failures which occurred during performance in order to address those incidents in the debriefing phase of each day's treatment. This on-line aspect of Focus on Form has also been troublesome in other areas of language teaching (Doughty & Varela, 1998). Probably, this study should have employed other two native English-speakers so that they could provide effective, positive feedback to sociopragmatic failures while the instructors were performing with students in FonFS and FonF groups.

The Rating System

The researchers faced the complexity of adopting the rating system. Hudson, Detmer and Brown (1995) provided a previously tested, six-criteria, five-point rating system for DCTs. The raters in the present study initially accepted the tests and the rating system as a "package," believing that this rating

system must be best suited to these tests. However, the five-point scale had several disadvantages, the first being the difficulties that the raters encountered in agreeing on a definition for each of the six criteria. While the raters could quickly and easily agree on a definition for "speech act" (e.g., request, apology) and rate consistently for that criterion, other criteria such as Amount of Information and Degree of Politeness were difficult to rate in isolation, as they appeared to overlap considerably in many cases. The second difficulty inherent in the rating scale was assigning pragmatic appropriateness on the five-point scale. Because of these two problems, while the raters were able to determine whether each subject's response was overall appropriate for the given situation, they required a great deal of training to agree where (i.e. according to which criteria) the pragmatic breakdown specifically occurred and to what degree it affected the overall appropriateness of the response.

With these difficulties in mind, a recommendation for future replications of this study is that the raters first assign a global rating to each response (i.e., "appropriate" vs. "inappropriate"), and then determine the specific area(s) in which respective breakdowns occurred, without having to assign a numerical rating to each criterion. For example, an item might simply be rated as "inappropriate: Degree of Directness and Amount of Information." Furthermore, a more reliable and effective method of rating the data might dispose of the six pre-established but only vaguely defined categories presented in Hudson, Detmer and Brown (1995). The latter allows the raters to develop their own, mutually understood and defined categories through initially analyzing a random sampling of the data.

CONCLUSION

This study marks the first attempt at testing the notion that Focus on Form may be an effective instructional framework for teaching language aspects other than grammar. Specifically, we operationalized FonF through an enhanced role-play treatment, with increased sociopragmatic competence in making requests as our target of instruction. The effectiveness of a FonF+FonF debriefing treatment was tested against that of a FonF+FonFS debriefing, and the performance of both groups was measured against that of a control group who engaged in role-play without instructor intervention or instruction. While no significant differences were found between the three treatment groups, these inconclusive findings should not be seen as evidence or the failure of FonF in the realm of second language pragmatics instruction. The brevity of treatment in this study, combined with the implicit nature of the treatment (implicit treatments generally take longer to demonstrate their yielded effects than explicit ones do) made statistically significant results unlikely. The emergence of a trend in one criterion (i.e., Degree of Directness) suggests that the treatment was beginning to "catch."

The great value of this exploratory research lies in its exposure of several key issues which future researchers examining FonF in pragmatics instruction will want to bear in mind. These issues include the importance of narrowing the focus of instruction, training instructors to recognize, isolate and address pragmatic breakdowns in the targeted area without losing track of their own role in furthering communicative goals, and developing assessment measures and rating systems which efficiently and accurately reflect the effects of FonF on students' pragmatic competence. In addressing these issues, this study

adds to research on innovative methods for teaching pragmatics, and to research which seeks to expand the scope of FonF treatment beyond grammar instruction. Further research is needed in both of these areas, as the field of second language pedagogy can only benefit from continual efforts to find the best matches between specific instructional targets and treatment types.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Professors Cathy Doughty, Gabriele Kasper, Thom Hudson, James D. Brown, Kate Wolfe-Quintero, Kenton Harsh, the National Foreign Language Resource Center at the University of Hawaii at Manoa (Director, Richard Schmidt).

THE AUTHORS

Yoshinori J. Fukuya is pursuing a Ph.D. in second language acquisition at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Melissa Reeve, Jeniffer Gisi and Mary Christianson are pursuing an MA in ESL at the University of Hawaii at Manoa.

REFERENCES

Beebe, L. M., & Cummings, M. C. (1985). Speech act performance: A function of the data collection procedures? In Paper presented at TESOL Convention, New York:

Billmyer, K. (1990). "I really like your lifestyle": ESL learners learning how to compliment. Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 6(2), 31–48.

Brown, J. D. (1996). Testing in language programs. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Regent.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1997). Direct approaches in L2 instruction: A turning point in communicative language teaching. TESOL Quarterly, 31(1), 141–152.

DiPietro, R. (1987). Strategic Interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C. (1991). Second language instruction does make a difference: Evidence from an empirical study of SL relativization. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13(4), 431–469.

Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative Focus on Form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition (pp. 114–138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition (pp. 197–261). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18(2), 225–253.

Hudson, T., Detmer, E., & Brown, J. D. (1995). Developing prototypic measures of cross-cultural pragmatics. Honolulu: HI: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Kasper, G. (1997). Can pragmatic competence be taught? http://www.lll.hawaii.edu/NFLRC/Networks/NW6

Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). The natural approach. New York: Pergammon.

Kubota, M. (1995). Teachability of conversational implicature to Japanese EFL learners. The Institute for Research in Language Teaching Bulletin, 9, 35–67.

Leech, G. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. New York: Longman.

Long, H. M. (1981). Input, interaction, and second-language acquisition. In H. Winitz (Eds.), Native language and foreign language acquisition (pp. 259–278). NY: The New York Academy of Science.

Long, H. M. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. Applied Linguistics, 4(2), 126–141.

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective (pp. 39–52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Long, M. H., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition (15–41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muranoi, H. (1996). Effects of interaction inhancement on restructuring of interlanguage grammar: A cognitive approach to foreign language instruction. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Georgetown University.

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1990). The learning of complex speech act behavior. TESL Canada Journal. 7. 45–65.

Prahbu, N. S. (1987). Second language pedagogy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 11(2), 129–158.

Schmidt, R. (1993). Awareness and second language acquisition. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13, 206–226.

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. (1993). Instruction and the development of questions in the L2 classroom. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15(2), 205–221.

Tateyama, Y., Kasper, G., Mui, L. P., Tay, H., & Thananart, O. (1997). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatics routines. Pragmatics and Language Learning, 8, 163–177. Urbana, Ill: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. Applied Linguistics, 4(1), 91–112.

Wilkins, D. (1976). Notional syllabuses. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, J., & Evans, J. (1998). What kind of forms and on which forms? In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition (pp. 139–155). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yamashita, S. O. (1996). Six measures of JSL pragmatics. (Technical Report #14). Honolulu, Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Appendix A

Treatment

Interaction Enhancement

	Experimental 1 Focus on FormS	Experimental 2 Focus on Form	Control
Rehearsal Phase	Written scenarios were used. Role A was given to students, who worked in pairs for 10 minutes to prepare for the performance.	Same as EX1	Same as EX1
Performance Phase	Students (representatives from each pair) taking Role A and the instructor taking Role B in scenarios performed the interactions until they found some solutions. The instructor holds up "a sad face" to indicate socio-pragmatic failures.	Same as EX1 Same as EX1	Same as EX1 Students just role-played.
Debriefing Phase	Explicit instruction was given on interlocutors' social power and status differences, familiarity, request strategy types and downgraders, etc.	The instructor raised students' consciousness on communicative goals, interlocutors' social and status differences, etc.	Students discussed something related to the content of the interactions.